

Date: Wed, 8 Jun 94 04:30:13 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #244
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Wed, 8 Jun 94 Volume 94 : Issue 244

Today's Topics:

-----> Re: Usefulness of the amateur service
 Code test speeds
 Coordination
 Legal Protections for Hams
 Usefulness of the amateur service (2 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Mon, 06 Jun 1994 04:00:00 EST
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!wariat.org!
amcomp!dan@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: -----> Re: Usefulness of the amateur service
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

md@maxcy2.maxcy.brown.edu (Michael P. Deignan) writes:

>Any emergency management agency or relief service which builds its
>emergency communications network around cell service is incredibly inept.
>
>You are correct in stating that the ARS provides emergency communications in
>disaster situations. Over the past couple of years we've seen several
>examples.
>
>However, does this qualify as a "national benefit"? What percentage of
>licensed operators actually participated in those emergency situations?
>Were their actions only something that could be obtained as the result

>of having an ARS, or, if the ARS didn't exist, would other, better
>systems be in place to accomplish the same type of tasks?

>

>I happen to think that if the ARS didn't exist, that other systems
>performing a similar task would be in place. I don't think that the
>ARS adds value to the nation as a whole with our presence. Because of
>this, I think its inappropriate to call the ARS a SERVICE, but to call
>it what it really is today - a hobby. Its been sold as a hobby by the
>League and other organizations seeking to get "new blood" into the
>hobby, and that's exactly what its become: a hobby, not a service.

As usual Michael, you're wrong. We still meet all the purposes (possibly
excluding, arguably, advancing the radio art). If we are a hobby, with all
the pressure for spectrum, we would rate about a half a meg worth on 40
meters. PERIOD.

Dan N8PKV

--

"Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price
of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God! I know not what
course others may take, but as for me, GIVE ME LIBERTY, OR GIVE ME
DEATH!" -Patrick Henry, Virginia House of Burgesses on March 23,1775

Date: Mon, 06 Jun 1994 03:55:00 EST

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!
wariat.org!amcomp!dan@network.ucsd.edu

Subject: Code test speeds

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

mjsilva@ted.win.net (Michael Silva) writes:

>Yes, I would agree, and I would also add "interest". I don't think
>smart appliance operators benefit the hobby much more than dumb ones!
>But I was responding to a particular instance of somebody saying
>something that made no sense, seemingly just for the sake of giving
>the code another knock.

>

>While I don't worship at the CW altar (and I don't think most of it's
>defenders do), I don't really believe that CW is just another mode. I
>think it is unique in that provides the greatest capabilities with the
>least amount and complexity of equipment, and in the classroom that is
>supposed to be amateur radio, that should have some value.

IF what you said about code where true, I might agree with you. Since it
is NOT true, I do not.

73,

Dan

--

"Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God! I know not what course others may take, but as for me, GIVE ME LIBERTY, OR GIVE ME DEATH!" -Patrick Henry, Virginia House of Burgesses on March 23, 1775

Date: 7 Jun 1994 18:04:58 GMT

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!nic-nac.CSU.net!charnel.ecst.csuchico.edu!olivea!ncd.com!newshost.ncd.com!sheridan.ncd.com!steve@network.ucsd.edu

Subject: Coordination

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <770616292snx@skyld.grendel.com>, jangus@skyld.grendel.com (Jeffrey D. Angus) writes:

|> A few years back, the FCC announced that the 220 MHz amateur band will
|> shrink a few MHz.
|>
|> So.... the local coordinating body for 220 (220SMA in Southern Calif.)
|> went through the effort of attempting to determine a new band plan.

stuff deleted for brevity's sake.

|> What's the point? Well, it appears that as a group amateurs can NOT reach
|> ANY kind of a consensus on ANYTHING. And the result is that the FCC has to
|> be brought in to settle who gets to play in the sand box and with which
|> toys. As usual, we're not going to like the results. But then I doubt that
|> we'll be able to agree on anything before it's too late either.
|>
|> Things need to be resolved about morse code proficiency, technical awareness,
|> and the priorities of users and various modes on the available spectrum. It
|> would help if we could do more than just find fault with every one/thing/else.
|>
|> Just a thought....
|> 73
|> Jeff
|>
|>
|> Amateur: WA6FWI@WA6FWI.#SOCA.CA.USA.NOAM | "You have a flair for adding
|> Internet: jangus@skyld.grendel.com | a fanciful dimension to an

Jeff,

How things worked in Southern CA isn't how they work all over the country (thankfully)!

In Northern CA the methodology was just the opposite. Everyone considered themselves in the same boat. The attitude was "Everything is affected, so everyone is going to have to share in the pain." Open meetings were held at least 5 times all around Northern CA. (Not just in the populous areas!)

Everyone who wanted a voice really did have a chance to speak. A bandplan was adopted with the full consent of both NARCC membership and the other major coordinating body NCPA(for packet!) Note - the bandplan we adopted turned out to precisely parallel ARRL's! Once the bandplan was in place, a committee was formed to re-hash the repeater allocation. 12 repeaters were asked to move frequency, i.e. we actually re-coordinated the entire band!

For the most part, all of the repeaters moved willingly, and quickly! So this turns out to be a huge success story locally. That's the good news. The bad news as you point out, is that we continue to squabble about all manner of things.

Many of the issues you raised are of National interest, not just parochial. This is where ARRL comes in. I spent last Saturday yelling at my ARRL Director about ARRL not listening to their membership. The normal counter for this is that the membership continues to just think of QST as a magazine subscription, and chooses not to take an active part in resolving issues. We spend a great deal of time pissing and moaning on the air about how the other guy should do this or that when REALLY we should be stepping up and shouldering some of the responsibility for how things are ourselves.

I applaud the fact that you went to the 220SMA meetings and had some real alternatives to suggest! Perhaps if more of the amateurs in Southern CA had taken the time to get involved, the outcome might have been different.

Steve KA6S

Date: 7 Jun 1994 19:07:24 GMT
From: parc!xerox!jacobi@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: Legal Protections for Hams
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

> On a VERRRRRRY loosely related subject, how about eliminating the
> "industrial exemption" clause in your state's engineering registration law?
> These exemptions, which most if not all states have, allow unlicensed

> "engineers (who may not even have any engineering education or experience)
> to practice as engineers as long as they only design manufactured goods. Would
> you allow an unlicensed physician, who can only kill one person at a time to
> practice medicine? How about an unlicensed automotive "engineer" who could
> kill many people with a single mistake?

In my opinion the comparison does not hold. An engineer works typically for a company and they can interview and test the engineer before hiring them. A physician works with individual patients. An individual patient does rarely have the skills or the time to interview a physician whether he knows any medicine or not.

Christian KD6WYC

Oh BTW. If you get elected, don't worry too much about special ham issues. Just make this place a little better for everybody living here...

Oops, please make the FCC more efficient. I don't have any gripe with whom gets a license and who doesn't, but why does this require 8 weeks handling?

Date: Mon, 06 Jun 1994 04:46:00 EST
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!wariat.org!amcomp!
dan@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Usefulness of the amateur service
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

md@pstc3.pstc.brown.edu (Michael P. Deignan) writes:

>My point is that someone claimed that the Amateur Radio Service
>exists to be a benefit to the nation. I'm glad when people can
>get involved in the hobby and learn new things.
>
>However, my contention is that the amateur radio SERVICE offers
>nothing to the nation, except in rare cases of emergency communications,
>and in all circumstances offers nothing that couldn't be more easily
>or effectively accomplished utilizing some other type of resources
>which do not involve the ARS.
>
>I'm waiting for someone to convince me otherwise.

For those who understand, no explanation is necessary. For those who don't, no explanation will suffice.

In other words, you had to be there. Since all the ARS is to you is a hobby, that is all you will ever get out of it. I feel sorry for you.

Dan N8PKV

--

"Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God! I know not what course others may take, but as for me, GIVE ME LIBERTY, OR GIVE ME DEATH!" -Patrick Henry, Virginia House of Burgesses on March 23, 1775

Date: Mon, 06 Jun 1994 04:20:00 EST
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!wariat.org!
amcomp!dan@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Usefulness of the amateur service
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

md@pstc3.pstc.brown.edu (Michael P. Deignan) writes:

>dan@amcomp.com (Dan Pickersgill) writes:
>
>> The spectrum is allocated because of our benefit
>> to the nation, not to support the postal service.
>
>Dan,
>
>Other than occasional disaster-relief assistance, what benefit to
>the nation do amateur operators really provide?

A pool of trained radio operators. (Read appliance operators.)
Communications into and out of disaster areas is ETREAMLY important. To be able to talk to one of the Islands (PR, VI et. al.) after a major interruption to regular service is INVALUABLE. (But you said other than.)
We provide public service communications at regular special events (walk-a-thons bike-a-thons soccer turniments, etc...). We give the average Joe (or Mike) a place to experiance USING radio.

For any who have worked a Help Desk these things (Computers/radios) can not be used by the general public very well. Just look at the hams who have trouble programming their HT. We need a ground to develop the ability.

Promoting international good will. (Nuff said)

Advancing the art WILL start happening more and more as our ranks grow and more technically oriented people are drawn into the service. As an example a few hams, myself included, are working together to set up our own repeater. This is nothing special in its own, we are doing it to further OUR UNDERSTANDING on how repeaters work. (Self training!) And we will be

pushing the edge as soon as we can get ourselves there.

But I personally feel that the public service aspect is sufficient.

>

>I daresay that you would be hardpressed to find one good example
>where amateur operators are a benefit - a benefit which couldn't be matched
>or even bettered by an alternative arrangement.

>

>MD

>--

>-- Michael P. Deignan

>-- Amalgamated Baby Seal Poachers Union, Local 101

>-- "Get 'The Club'... Endorsed by Baby Seal poachers everywhere..."

--

"Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price
of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God! I know not what
course others may take, but as for me, GIVE ME LIBERTY, OR GIVE ME
DEATH!" -Patrick Henry, Virginia House of Burgesses on March 23,1775

Date: Tue, 7 Jun 1994 18:05:40 GMT

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!library.ucla.edu!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!news.msfc.nasa.gov!

cs.utk.edu!stc06r.CTD.ORNL.GOV!ornl!xdepc.eng.ornl.gov!wyn@network.ucsd.edu

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <rogjdCqy0o3.6MB@netcom.com>, <wyn.11.2DF31D2A@ornl.gov>,

<1994Jun6.135409.1@skyler.mavd.honeywell.com>ov

Subject : Re: HF Message Handling

In article <1994Jun6.135409.1@skyler.mavd.honeywell.com>

estey@skyler.mavd.honeywell.com writes:

> What has become clear in 8 years of operating under the STA is that:

>A. An organized and closed network must exist to make traffic routing reliable
>and predictable. This basically precludes those stations involved in the
>forwarding network from allowing "user" access.

>B. A limited number of stations in the "national" network is most effective.
>Having too many folks involved in the process slows down messages and can
>result in dead-ends.

>C. We badly need to upgrade our modes of operation from Packet. Pactor,
>G-TOR, and Clover might be good candidates!

> And that is what stopped the group from
>going farther - we couldn't agree on a band-plan that would satisfy
>everyone. It appears that the subband issue may be what scuttled the ARRL
>Digital Committee in their January report to the ARRL Board.

>The basic problem is that it is "OK to gore an ox - as long as it's not your
>own!" It is OKAY to cut someone else's frequency band to enjoy their
>favorite aspect of the hobby - but don't you DARE touch mine!

>What we need to realize is that everyone has the right to have a place to
>enjoy their favorite aspect of the hobby. We must NOT disenfranchise anyone!

>> Society. It appears that the FCC has not been impressed with DWB operations
>> allowed under the STA and may deny the petitions.
>>

>PLEASE tell us where you got this info.

First, my apologies for violating netiquette by writing "It appears...",
instead of "It seems to me..." or "IMHO it appears...", poor choice of words
on my part, perhaps misleading you to thinking I was quoting a wizard or FCC
source.

Second, after reading your problem/solution statements, I arrive at the same
conclusion. No politically savvy bureaucracy is going to provide a RM that
causes controversy or spurs the current instabilities in band sharing
discipline if it can be avoided. Until the FCC receives assurances from the
ARRL that the subsequent band plan required to implement the RM is palatable
by the majority of amateurs or its mailboxes stop running over with
dissenting opinions, it will be difficult to believe that such an RM is
forthcoming.

Concerning your "A" and "B" assessments above, do you really think the the
ARRL will devise and the FCC will endorse a small elite group of operators
with authorization for channelized frequency privileges for HF operation?
When has this ever been done before on HF? It is true that we channelize now
with VHF and UHF repeater/satellite pairs and, maybe to stretch a point, even
on 10 meters, but normally it is "<center freq.> +/- QRM" on HF. When it
comes to limiting participants you may arrive at something akin to the 440
So.Cal. thread going on here.

Concerning your "C" assessment, this reminds me of the old saw "the enemy of
good is better". There is always going to be better software around the
corner. Also, there is always going to be pressure for higher throughput rates
with minimum bandwidth expansion, particularly on HF. What about an every five
year change date at which time the latest proven protocol/software/etc. is
implemented? -in other words, control obsolescence to a period of a few months
every five years instead of constantly chasing after new software and never

On the other hand, perhaps all of your concerns have been answered in the current petitions before the FCC. While we are on the subject it might be interesting to roll out copies of those petitions here for all to see and perhaps comment on. What do you think?

```
=====
= Cooperation requires participation.  Competition teaches cooperation. =
=====
      . . . _ . . . _ . _ . _ . . . _ . _ . _ . _ . _ . . . _ _
=====
```

References <CSLE87-030694103539@145.1.114.19>, <2stdg1\$642@nyx10.cs.du.edu>,
<CSLE87-060694105004@145.39.1.10>ft.C0
Subject : Re: 440 in So. Cal.

Now wait just a cotton pickin' minute! The Texas VHF-FM Society has it's problems, but it is most certainly not an "old boys" group. What you describe as an "old boys" group is the manifestation of what I call the "90/10" rule... that 90% of the work is done by 10% of the people.

One system to one pair is working fine for now. If, in the future, the need grows to a point where sharing is politically acceptable to the membership, the Society will change the rules. It simply isn't necessary at the present time.

>There's no reason to join TVHFS when the defacto coordination
>policy is that new repeater requests will be rejected because the
>long-timers are not willing to share their frequency pairs with any other
>amateur repeater stations.

I've never known any coordinator to tell someone they can't have a frequency.
They might be told they can't have 34/94, but they can have something,
somewhere. Just because there aren't any 2 meter frequencies available,
doesn't mean there is no place for you to play. Unfortunately, this isn't
good enough for some people.

>One more time: 97.101b strictly and explicitly prohibits the assignment of
>any frequency "for the exclusive use of any station."

Yeah, and there are other rules that prohibit interfering with another station
who happens to be using said frequency. This dog won't hunt. Frequency
coordination works. It has its problems, but it works.

>Nobody except you said that the prior repeater had to pack up and leave.
>ALL repeater users do need to recognize and remember that ALL frequencies
>in the Amateur Radio Service are shared according to law; the same is also
>true for user/licencees under Part 90.

...and there are good technical ways to accomplish this. The problem comes
from the political aspects of frequency coordination. You can't fix this
with PL tones or any other technical solution. Political problems must
be solved politically.

>IMHO, the band is full when ALL useable frequencies are in use more than
>75% of the total time available, which happens to be 24 hours a day. This
>definition still leaves 6 full hours every day when nothing is on the air
>on any given channel. Compare 2M to 20M if you want to know what a "full"
>band sounds like, modulation differences and long-winded political
>diatribes aside.

There are many commercial systems in Houston which don't meet this criteria...

I would personally like to see carrier squelch repeaters phased out completely
for the very reason you are presenting. It would make much more sense to use
some form of restricted access (PL or whatever) to limit the input only to
those amateurs who want to access this particular repeater. Unfortunately,
the politics of the situation aren't right at the present time. Maybe in the
future.

--

Jim Reese, WD5IYT		"Real Texans don't let the truth get in
jreese@sugar.neosoft.com		the way of a good story."

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #244
